DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 055 CG 010 361

TITLE	Substance Abuse Prevention Education Program. 1974-75 Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Michigan State Dept. of Education, Lansing.; Michigan State Dept. of Public Health, Detroit.
PUB DATE	Nov 75
NOTE	98p.; Prepared by Office of Substance Abuse Services of Public Health Department
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Consultation Programs; *Drug Abuse; *Educational Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; Family Counseling; Organizational Change; Paraprofessional School Personnel; *Parent Education; *Prevention; *School Environment; Students

ABSTRACT

The Substance Abuse Prevention Education (SAPE) program aims at: (1) having a direct impact on young people to prevent substance abuse; (2) working with school teachers, parents, and other citizens to develop specific skills that will facilitate substance abuse prevention; and (3) providing program participants with better understanding of the nature of substance abuse, its causes and its prevention. The SAPE program engaged in the following activities during 1974-75: (1) the introduction of basic substance abuse educational ideas to participant groups; (2) provision of information and consultation to interested schools and citizens; (3) specific training programs geared to school staffs to improve in-school curricula and teaching formats, relative to substance abuse prevention; (4) the setting up of student service centers; (5) the training of a cadre of paraprofessional citizen-trainers; (6) involvement of the entire family in substance abuse prevention; and (7) working with schools and school districts on policies and procedures which facilitate a school climate conducive to substance abuse prevention. The seven program activities received emphasis in the order mentioned as far as percent of staff-time was concerned. Most participants expressed satisfaction and said they felt the program helped them considerably. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED119055

1974-1975 Evaluation Report

Substance Abuse Prevention Education Program

November, 1975

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

CG 010 351

Jointly submitted by the Michigan Department of Education and the Office of Substance Abuse Services, Michigan Department of Public Health

1974-75 Evaluation Report

SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION EDUCATION PROGRAM

November, 197

Jointly submitted by
The Michigan Department of Education
and
The Office of Substance Abuse Services
Department of Public Health

This report was prepared under the direction of Dr. Bradley S. Greenberg, 2049 Ashland Avenue, Okemos, Michigan, pursuant to a contract with the Michigan Department of Education. The senior evaluation staff members were Mark Steinberg and George Lafkas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
EVALUATION OF PROGRAM ACTIVITIES:	
1. CORE CONCEPT EVENTS	6
2. FAMILY EDUCATION	14
3. ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	19
4. STUDENT SERVICE CENTERS	25
5. SCHOOL-RELATED SKILL AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT	39
6. TRAINING OF TRAINERS	56
7. CONSULTATION RESOURCES	63
ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM COSTS	68
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRESS IN EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES	79
APPENDIX A	88
APPENDIX B	93

INTRODUCTION

The Substance Abuse Prevention Education (SAPE) program completed its third year of activity during 1974-75. This program has several key goals. One is to have a direct impact on young people, either to prevent or reduce substance abuse. A second is to work with school teachers, parents and other citizens to develop specific skills that will facilitate substance abuse prevention. Another is to provide an educational opportunity for each program participant to better understand the nature of substance abuse, its causes, and its prevention.

Substance abuse is believed to be more a people problem than a substance problem. The program is oriented to participants' making personal decisions that there are better ways of living and coping with life than by relying on substances.

At present there are five regional programs, one of which began educational program activity in 1971, and the remainder in 1972. The five regional SAPE programs and the intermediate school districts they serve are:

Regions 7 and 8, titled the GATEWAY program, and serving Montcalm, Ionia, Kent, Ottawa, and Allegan;

Region 12, serving Barry, Branch, Calhoun, Kalamazoo, and St. Joseph;

Region 14, titled TRIAD, and serving Shiawassee, Genessee, and Lapeer;

Region 20, titled DARTE, and serving Wayne;

Region 21, serving Marquette-Alger, Delta-Schoolcraft, Menominee, and Dickinson-Iron.

Based primarily in school environments, the programs principally rely on a two-step flow of information and conviction principle. Professional staff members provide training to individuals--teachers, students, parents, administrators, and community groups. They expect that the initial recipients of this training effort will behave in such ways as to subsequently influence those with whom they are in frequent contact. The first generation of participants will have new ways to deal with their own problems, and with problems in their schools and communities. Their demonstration and sharing of this information and these skills, through normal daily acts, also will serve as desirable models for those around them. For example, teachers have a daily opportunity to implement these skills in the classroom. In addition, a significant number of them actively engage in training others in substance abuse prevention and education methods.

The present evaluation effort covers the 1974-75 programming year. All data reported in this paper originated with the regional staffs. Data which the regions had collected during the year were collated, synthesized, and aggregated by the evaluation team in order to provide a cross-region analysis and evaluation of program activities. There were no provisions for the evaluation team to collect new or original data.

During the course of the entire evaluation period, however, the evaluation team provided to the Michigan Department of Education three extensive documents:

(1) A systematic description of regional program activity, in terms of focus and content;

(2) A collection and evaluation of all instruments being used by all regional programs to collect data on program participants;

(3) A package of newly developed and partly pre-tested instruments to assist regional programs in subsequent evaluation periods.

As this report will demonstrate, different regions emphasize different training components in their implementation of the same basic concepts. However, at a state program level, there have been defined a number of basic task activities, and this report is organized around those activities. These basic task activities, and their evaluation in the regions, comprise the subsequent sections of this report. These activities are:

1. Core concept events--the introduction of basic substance abuse educational ideas to participant groups.

2. Family education--an effort to involve the entire family in substance abuse prevention.

3. Organizational development--working with the schools and school districts on policies and procedures which facilitate a "school climate" that is conducive to substance abuse prevention.

4. Student service centers--working with the schools to establish in-school information and consultation bases for substance abuse prevention.

5. School-related skill and resource development--specific training programs geared to school staffs to improve in-school curricula and teaching formats, relative to substance abuse prevention.

6. Training of trainers--extending the outreach capacity of the professional staffs in the five programs by training a cadre of para-professional citizen-trainers.

7. Consultation resources--providing information and consultation to all interested citizens and schools, and stimulating interest where it does not presently exist.

For each of these program activities, the evaluation data we have been able to examine focus primarily on the following criteria:

1. Frequency of programs of a given type
2. Staff energy devoted to program category
3. Number of enrolled program participants
4. The characteristics of the participants
5. The content emphases within the particular program
6. Participant reactions to the programs offered

These data have been assembled to varying extents in the regions, in some cases more completely documentable to us than in others. We present them at face value, drawing what conclusions and inferences seem reasonable and logical to us.

Our opening to each section describes the program activity, in a composite form. Although the implementation varies somewhat from region to region, the composite characterization provides an accurate summary statement.

After the separate sections describing each major program activity and the appropriate evaluation data, we have written a section on program costs. There, we have been able to relate the magnitude of program activity to program budgets and staff time. This provides an evaluative measure of financial accountability which should be particularly interesting to readers of this report. That section also serves to tie together all regional program activity in a single panorama.

The final section of the report is a set of recommendations regarding subsequent evaluation needs and procedures.

Activity: CORE CONCEPT EVENTS

Basically, this program activity is akin to a commercial. It is a small dose of a larger program model that is designed to interest, persuade, convince, and inform receivers as to its merits. It is a basic means by which regions advertise their more intensive training programs. It is an introduction to parents, to school people, to students, and to all others, as to the kind of prevention resources they are likely to receive should they decide to establish a continuing relationship with one of the region programs.

Although there are some regional differences in their approaches to specific core concepts and to the subset of core concepts which they emphasize, it is possible to identify three basic groups of core concepts.

1. One group of concepts is directly tied to substance abuse. These include identification and description of different kinds of substances that young people may abuse, e.g., drugs, alcohol, and tobacco. They also include drug pharmacology topics, such as the make-up of different drugs, and the short- and long-term effects of abuse. Other concepts in this group include the law as it relates to substance abuse, recognizing abuse symptoms, and responding to overdose problems.

2. A second set of core concepts is based on this state program's philosophy that substance abuse is a "people problem." These concepts deal with the social and psychological factors that are important in understanding substance abuse problems, and in developing prevention and education strategies. They include communication skills, self-defeating behaviors, self-concept development, and values clarification. The regions believe that the personal and interpersonal processes which influence substance abuse should be the foci of ameliorative efforts.

3. The third group of concepts centers on prevention and education strategies, ways to develop and implement measures to reduce substance abuse. Because the primary targets of the regions' program efforts are students, these events are especially designed for school use by administrators, teachers, and counselors. Issues such as affective education, school policies and procedures, and student service centers are part of this third set. In addition, the regions suggest strategies for use by community groups, concerned parents and such professionals as social workers and psychologists. The regions emphasize that prevention and education should be a total community effort.

In the opening to this section, we emphasized the sales function of conducting core concept events. There are other functions in addition to introducing the basic notions. Equally important functions are to stimulate awareness and

concern about substance abuse issues, to provide interested people with useful information, and to dispel common misconceptions about substance abuse. Finally, these events are designed to urge people to become constructively active in working to prevent substance abuse.

"Becoming active" may involve participating in lengthier region-sponsored training programs, forming groups to work for substance abuse prevention in their schools and communities, and modifying their own teaching or parenting behaviors from what they have learned.

A given core concept presentation may involve an in-depth discussion of one or two topics. On another occasion, it may be a more wide-ranging, but a briefer introduction to half a dozen concepts. Normally, they range from an hour or two to a day or two. Core concept presentations evolve both from regional suggestions to school administrations, and from school requests for them. Again, the idea is to follow up these presentations with more systematic and developed programs ranging over several days or weeks.

Evaluation Findings

There was considerable variation among the regions during the past year in terms of delivery of core concept events. For Region 21, core concept events involved 20% of its staff's time. In TRIAD this activity encompassed about one-fourth of total staff time. For two others--DARTE and

GATEWAY--it was half that figure, and in Region 12, only about 3% of staff time was given to this program component.

There was a basic core of topics actually dealt with in these presentations:

All five regions dealt with these topics--

Values clarification

Communication skills

Self-concept

Four regions typically included--

Affective education

Three regions commonly dealt with--

Pharmacology of drugs

Decision-making

Counselor education

Exposure. In all the five regions identified 119 separate core concept event presentations. More impressive is the wide exposure received for those presentations. Data assembled from all five regions indicate that no less than 5,073 adults and young people were in the audiences for core concept programs. About 40% were teachers, 25% were students, 15% were parents and community groups, and the remainder from among school administrators and school counselors. Each time a core concept presentation was made, there were about 60 participants.

Of additional import is the extensiveness of follow-ups stimulated by core concept presentations. After all, the focus

of the core concept was to stimulate interest in getting more of the same. Two of the regions maintained data which indicated whether the original core concept presentation led to a follow-up activity with the same group. From these two regions, there was follow-up programming to one-third of the presentations; for every three presentations, one resulted in further regional programming work. This again would appear to be a successful rate of return on the initial investment.

Participant Reactions. Each region engaged in some data collection from participants at core concept presentations. These data were forwarded to the evaluation team for aggregation and synthesis. Because these data were not collected in the same manner in different regions--each region creating its own instruments--aggregation across regions is not possible. But the data do sample the reactions of participants and are important indicators of participant satisfaction and interest in the content of core concept events.

Responses from 100 participants in six core concept programs were obtained to this question:

"How useful has this experience been to you?"

Very useful	47%
Useful	52%
Not useful	1%
Not worth coming	0%

At another program, this question was asked:

"To what degree do you think your workshop efforts may be beneficial to pupils in your classes?"

A great deal	54%
Some	44%
A little	2%
Not at all	0%

From still another program, two-thirds of the participants said they wanted to participate in other programs "like this one," and the same proportion said they would recommend to other people that they should take such a program if it were offered again in the area. Three-fourths expressed a specific need for such programs in their locale.

Parallel data from larger numbers of participants were accumulated in another region. Across several of their programs and an average of 100-125 respondents, these questions and response distributions demonstrate a strong positive response to the core concept events:

"Would you recommend this program to other schools/ colleagues?"

Yes	89%
No	11%

"My overall evaluation of this session is . . . "

Excellent	65%
Good	33%
Fair/Poor	2%

"I feel this orientation was time well spent."

Yes	95%
No	5%

Thus, what little evidence we have been able to examine shows strong positive responses immediately after the core

concept presentations. In one region, follow-up forms were mailed this spring to 331 people who had participated in an "awareness" session--that particular region's label for core concept presentations. The mail return brought a 15% response rate, which is less than a reliable sub-sample of the total participants. Nevertheless, using scales developed by the state evaluation team, those results indicate, for these respondents:

100% reported that they found the presentations useful.

100% reported an interest in further regional services.

Those returning the follow-up questionnaire were indeed especially supportive of these activities.

Although these immediately preceding results are based on a small number of participants, we could find no evidence that these core concept presentations were poorly received. The average judgment from 21 participants to these presentations looked like this:

Overall, did you think today's activities were:

interesting	___	↓	___	___	___	___	___ boring
impractical	___	___	___	___	___	↓	___ practical
useful	___	↓	___	___	___	___	___ useless
dull	___	___	___	___	↓	___	___ exciting
worth my time	___	↓	___	___	___	___	___ not worth my time
uninformative	___	___	___	___	___	↓	___ informative

The best evidence we have been able to examine validates two conclusions:

1. Core concept events are most favorably received, both for their utility and their interesting formats;

2. The presentations generate considerable enrollment in and request for other regional programs, at a rate of about one-third of the participant group.

Activity: FAMILY EDUCATION

The family plays a critical role in the development of a young person's social attitudes, including attitudes toward substances which may be abused. For this reason, the state program includes a family education component in its critical set of program activities. Focus on the family is another substance abuse prevention strategy.

The regional programs are working to explore the roles families may take in reducing and preventing substance abuse behaviors, and working with parents and children to establish family environments most conducive to positive social growth.

The development of family education programs has centered around three components:

Awareness

Skills

Community Action

The awareness component emphasizes the need for parents to have information about substance abuse. Parents should be familiar with various kinds of substances that may be available to their children. They also should know the reasons for their use and abuse and manifest signs of substance abuse. Further, staff persons discuss the family's influence on children's substance abuse patterns, stressing that parents

can play a vital role in helping their children choose constructive life styles. This informational component is often presented by a combination of staff persons, community professionals, parents and young people who have had experience with substance abuse problem behavior.

The skills component focuses on ways parents and children can develop mutually beneficial relationships. A variety of skills are taught. These include parent-child communication, trust building, recognizing feelings and problems, and mutual problem-solving. The staffs believe that the establishment of open parent-child relationships is essential both to reducing and preventing substance abuse. While considerable emphasis is placed on parenting skills in these programs, the importance of active and effective family participation by children is stressed also. The staffs seek to have parents and children participate together in portions of family education programs, so that the skills presented may be practiced with staff guidance.

The community action component is designed to interest parents in becoming more active in substance abuse prevention and education programs in their communities and schools, as well as in their own families. The staffs recognize a desire by many parents to become involved. However, many parents aren't sure of where and how they can be most effective. The action component outlines the opportunities that now exist for citizen involvement, and suggests ways to create opportunities where none exist.

Most program participants in this activity are parents. However, the programs conducted have also interested young childless couples concerned with the potential problem in their future families. Additionally, teachers and professionals whose work centers on family problems have participated.

Evaluation Findings

The program description above is more a statement of intention than of practice. Only one region--Region 12--devotes any substantial portion of its staff effort to family education activities. In this region, it constitutes somewhat more than one-third of total staff effort, 37%, including planning time. There, the program typically runs 2 hours per session for eight sessions, over eight weeks. In 1974-75, Region 12 conducted 31 separate major family education programs. Elsewhere, there were two major family education programs in DARTE, one each in two other regions, and none in a fifth.

Region 12 has developed two different family education programs. One of these focuses in particular on family communication skills, emphasizing discussion and listening skills. The other is centered on the elimination of self-defeating behaviors in the family relationship context.

In all, 184 parents and 65 people in other capacities participated in family education programs during 1974-75. Clearly, this is a relatively small program in terms of its outreach. The bulk of these participants were in the Region 12 programs.

Participant Reactions. In this developing program, participant responses, though gathered on a small-scale basis, are uniformly positive on both affective and cognitive measures.

Data were collected for one of the DARTE programs:

"Usefulness of this DARTE clinic to individual participants."

Very useful	75%
Useful	25%
Not useful	0%
Not worth coming	0%

"Degree of participant's feelings toward how workshop efforts may be beneficial to children at home."

A great deal	80%
Some	20%
A little	0%
Not at all	0%

Participants' rating of staff

Excellent	75%
Satisfactory	25%
Poor	0%

More extensive data were obtained in Region 12. Instruments were administered in conjunction with the self-defeating behavior workshops, and not with the family communication events. A subset of approximately 30 program participants was asked:

"Have you eliminated the self-defeating behaviors you worked on during the workshop - and have you used the course materials since the workshop ended?"

82% said YES

"Would you be interested in a refresher course in self-defeating behaviors, and/or in a Family Communication Workshop?"

76% said YES

Even more impressive than these expressions of utility and interest are data collected on cognitive aspects of these workshops. In Region 12, 169 program participants in self-defeating behavior workshops were given a 10-item test which assessed their understanding of concepts explicated during the program, and their ability to explain those same concepts.

Here are three sample items from that instrument:

"Mary made me cry today. It seems as though she would feel guilty about that."

"I agreed with Carol even though I really felt she was totally wrong."

"I really want to ask Sophie out, but the last three times I asked girls out they refused."

For each item, the participant had to identify and explain the concept. Regional program staff members read and scored the test items. On the average, each participant scored 8 of 10 correctly on this instrument. This was taken to indicate considerable understanding and integration of the program material.

Thus, the little data available on participant reaction to family education programs are suggestive of high acceptance and of high learning.

Activity: ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The organizational development program component has been oriented to two kinds of activities in this state program. One has focused on working with schools in terms of their school policies and procedures, e.g., rules and regulations, which bear on student behavior, particularly substance abuse behavior. A second, not unrelated, is the attempt to assess the general school atmosphere, or climate, as perceived by students, teachers, and others.

This program component stems from the state program philosophy that the ways in which a school relates to its students, and the general attitudes of the students toward the school, are important agents in the influence of students' substance abuse attitudes and behaviors. They are generally believed to be as influential as any formal aspects of the school's curriculum.

Administrative policies include rules and regulations governing student dress, truancy, smoking, drug and alcohol use, and academic performance. The policies not only set down acceptable codes of behavior within the school, but more importantly, they also indicate how school personnel will respond to infractions. If a student feels that he or she is a "bad" person, or isolated from the school community, or feels

disgraced before peers, the outcome is likely to be detrimental both to the student and the school.

This staff activity is geared to helping school administrators recognize these potential effects of varying school policies. They aim at altering the decision-making process of the school by opening up that process in some substantive areas to greater input from faculty, students, and parents. It is not an attempt to avoid having policies, but to discuss alternative policies which may be more constructive.

A school's climate is partly the result of its administrative policies toward students. School climate is important because: (1) the school environment in which students spend so much time is likely to influence their feelings about education, their communities, and their self-concepts; and (2) if the overall climate of a school is judged as poor by students, it is likely to make the efforts of school teachers and counselors more difficult. Students are likely to be more receptive to efforts at substance abuse prevention and education if these efforts originate in an organization which they believe respects, appreciates, and cares about them.

The state program has developed two types of organizational development services. One is conferences with school administrators about school policies. These are conducted on a building or school district level. In these conferences, the regional staff and school people discuss the potential significance of existing school policies with regard to substance

abuse, and work to modify policies when a need to do so is identified.

The second effort is to offer to conduct diagnostic surveys within schools to empirically determine the perceptions of school climate. These surveys typically are done with students and faculty. The results are used as a baseline for assessing current policies or their absence. The goal of these in-school surveys is that they be conducted both before and after any policy revisions are made, so that the effects of the policies on alterations in school climate can be validated. Of course, ongoing school climate assessments are the eventual objective--a continuing re-assessment of student and teacher beliefs.

Evaluation Findings

In only one region--DARTE--could this be considered an active program component. There, the regional director indicates that organizational development activities comprise 13% of overall staff effort. In the other four regions, there is either no activity at all, or up to a maximum 4% total program effort.

The general problem in regions with limited organizational development activities, or with abandoned ones, has been the lack of responsiveness of school districts once data have been collected. The translation of information provided by the data into school policy adjustments has been negligible.

The DARTE activity in organizational development has primarily consisted of the administration of a "school attitude

survey," as adapted by the DARTE staff. A copy of the instrument is in Appendix B. It consists of the administration of an 18-item inventory designed to tap five areas of school attitudes. To each item, respondents may give answers of "strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree."

The five question areas, and sample items are:

School policies (3 items)

e.g., "There are far too many rules and regulations in this school."

Student representation in school decision-making (2 items)

e.g., "Students in this school have a lot to say about how this school is run."

Staff-student relationships (6 items)

e.g., "Most teachers I know around here seem willing to give up their own free time to help students."

General school perceptions (6 items)

e.g., "I'm just one of a big crowd here. Nobody really deals with me as an individual."

Availability of clubs and activities (1 item)

e.g., "There are a wide variety of clubs and activities at this school."

During 1974-75, DARTE administered this instrument in six different schools. In three of these schools, data were collected at two points in time during the school year, whereas in the remainder, only the first administration was completed.

For each instrument administered, the DARTE staff supervises the preparation of a report back to the school, indicating the nature and interpreting the meaning of the responses obtained from both students and staff. Where there were both pre- and post-administrations, the DARTE summary report makes comparisons between the two administrations, and points out what changes appear to have occurred in the five areas of school attitudes cited above.

To date, the instrument itself has not been formally evaluated, either through dimensional or item analyses. Differences between pre- and post-measures have been analyzed by inspection, rather than by statistical means.

A typical DARTE attitude survey was administered at the John Glenn High School, in the Wayne-Westland School District in both February and June, 1975, and a comparative report provided in July, 1975. There is no indication of what school policy changes might have occurred between the two testings. Further, there are sizable differences in the groups sampled in the two time periods. For example, at the first testing, there were 268 10th through 12th graders, and at the second testing, there were 161 in the same grades. Complete computer printouts are provided to the schools together with the summary reports. Therefore, the schools can do whatever additional analyses of these data they desire.

It would appear that the most useful data from this instrument, in terms of the most impressive differences, are

the comparisons between data collected from staff and from students. Typically, the staff and students have quite different attitudes across a wide variety of issues. To document this may serve the school well in pinpointing potential and actual problem areas.

Activity: STUDENT SERVICE CENTERS

The state program has been instrumental in developing the concept of "student service centers" (SSC). A student service center is a place in a school where students can go for help with various kinds of problems. Sometimes a student needs guidance and advice in coping with a problem, and sometimes a student merely needs someone to talk with. Problems that students typically may bring to a center focus on drugs, alcohol, academic problems, running away from home, family problems, and parallel difficulties that often beset young people as they grow toward maturity.

The staff at an SSC may try to help a student directly, or they may refer the student to a community agency that specializes in the student's particular problem. Many centers also offer career and job guidance as well as job information.

Most SSCs are in high schools; some have been established in junior high schools. One or more faculty members function as directors in each center, on a full or part-time basis. The centers are also staffed with peer helpers and listeners. These are students who have been especially trained to respond to their peers' problems. They are a key element in this program activity. Both faculty and peer helpers stress that they are not in the roles of "psychiatrist" or "therapist."

When a student needs professional help, the staff tries to help the student find appropriate and competent professionals.

Many of the SSCs now operating in Michigan were established wholly or in part through the efforts of the five SAPE regional programs. Staff persons have worked to inform school administrators and teachers that these centers can be beneficial to the students who use them and also to the entire school community. SAPE professionals have been responsible for training faculty and student staffs at the centers. They provide continuing consultation and training services to operating centers.

There are several facets to the training of student service center staffs. One part involves instilling an awareness of the nature of guidance itself, the personal responsibility required, the need for protecting a student's identity, and the limitations of the helper's role.

Empathy skills, listening, and communication skills are given strong emphasis in the training. These focus on recognizing why a student has come to the center, correctly identifying the problem, and responding in a helpful, caring way.

Problem-solving skills are also emphasized. Once the student and staff member understand the nature of the problem, the next step is trying to work toward some resolution.

Many student problems do not afford the opportunity for this communication, exploration, and reflection. Some students come to the centers with immediate personal crises, perhaps a drug overdose or a personal trauma. To competently respond

to these situations, the staff are trained in crisis management. These are skills geared to responding immediately and effectively to severe problems.

Finally, the staff are trained to provide accurate information about substance abuse and a myriad of other problems perceived by the students.

After the staff has been trained initially, the regional staff typically continue to work with the centers. They provide access to community professionals, printed and taped information, and related advisory support. Moreover, because the school populations change significantly each year, so do the peer staffs. Staffing the centers with trained replacements is therefore a repetitive effort.

Evaluation Findings

To date, the state substance abuse prevention education program has been instrumental in the development and staffing of 27 student service centers in 22 high schools, 3 junior highs, and 2 combination junior-senior high schools. The full roster is an impressive sampling of Michigan secondary schools for the most part. SSCs exist in the following locations:

Byron High School	(Byron)
Carman High School	(Flint)
Clio High School	(Flint)
Comstock High School	(Comstock)
Daly Junior High School	(Flint)

Durand High School	(Durand)
Flint Central High School	(Flint)
Flint Northern High School	(Flint)
Forest Hills High School	(Grand Rapids)
Fremont High School	(Fremont)
Galesburg-Augusta High School	(Galesburg)
Grand Blanc High School	(Grand Blanc)
Greenville High School	(Greenville)
Kearsley High School	(Flint)
Lapeer High School	(Lapeer)
Marquette High School	(Marquette)
Merrill High School	(Merrill)
Negaunee High School (grades 7-12)	(Negaunee)
Northwestern High School	(Flint)
Owosso High School	(Owosso)
Portage Northern High School	(Portage)
Portage West Junior High School	(Portage)
Portland High School	(Portland)
Southwestern High School	(Flint)
Summit Junior High School	(Flint)
Van Buren High School	(Belleville)
Wakefield High School (grades 7-12)	(Wakefield)

Of these SSCs, 10 became fully operative during the current evaluation cycle, 17 were in their second or subsequent year of operation requiring additional staff training, and one

(Forest Hills) was organized to the point of initial operation during the 1975-76 school year. All but one of these centers function with the assistance of four of the five regional programs.

Of these 27 centers, 19 received program support from the regional offices during the evaluation cycle under study, thus constituting a major program effort. In the four regions with active SSC components, approximately 15% of staff resources were devoted to this activity.

Training. The greatest portion of staff time was spent in training programs with students and school staff members, designed to equip them with the requisite skills to operate a competent student service center. During 1974-75, a total of 809 persons underwent an extensive training effort. The vast majority of these were students, 704 in all, with the remainder consisting of school faculty, counselors, and administrators.

There is considerable variance across regions in the length of the training programs which have evolved. At a minimum, trainees receive 25 hours of staff effort; at the other extreme, the training program extends for 80 hours. Where there is less initial training, there is more likely to be subsequent training beyond the initial program offered.

Training for staff membership in the student service centers typically includes the following content areas:

Communication skills

Empathy training

Drug reaction management

Drug attitudes

Values clarification

Run-away counseling

Problem-solving processes

Self-disclosure

Listening skills

Self-defeating behavior training

Crisis intervention techniques

At the conclusion of the training cycle, the trainees are evaluated in terms of their suitability to assume roles of varying responsibility within student service centers. Two major criteria are used in assessing the trainees for SSC staff positions. The first is their mastery level of the concepts and skills provided in the training sessions. To assess this, simulations are provided for the demonstration of skills, and trial periods exist within the SSCs under the supervision of the center directors. The second is the judged interest and commitment of the trainees to function as SSC staff members, which may require the dedication of a considerable amount of free time in both initial and subsequent training.

These two criteria are applied by three sources--the regional staff trainers, the center directors, and the students themselves. The staff trainers report a high degree of consensus on the suitability of trainees, all scurces usually reaching the same conclusions. Center directors, of course,

have the ultimate responsibility for accepting individual students as members of their staffs. There is also considerable self-selection by the students.

If the students are not judged to be ready to assume a full role as a staff peer aide, they may be asked to fulfill other needed duties at the center, and undergo further training.

Center Usage. Data were compiled on frequency of visitations to 18 of the SSCs for problem information by boys and girls. During the 1974-75 school year, these centers reported no less than 19,750 visitations, or about 1,000 visitations to each and every center.

Of course, it is the case that not all these visitations are by different students. Those with a problem on one occasion tend to return for subsequent sessions, indirectly indicating some measure of satisfaction with the service rendered. For data compiled on 18 of the existing student service centers, a total of 4,393 different individuals were recorded, suggesting that the typical center user returns four or five times for some assistance from either a faculty or peer staff member. We would infer from these partial data that the SSCs fill a need in the school system not otherwise available.

Of great interest in this annual evaluation was the identification of problem frequency which attracted the students to the center initially. Fifteen SSCs collected and forwarded information to the regional offices which articulated the major problems of students serviced at the SSC. The following

table delineates the problem areas as we have re-ordered them from maximally to minimally occurring:

	Total Problem Frequency	% of the Problems
1. Problem information-seeking, e.g., drugs, alcohol, jobs	2,741	20%
2. Problem-guidance:		
a. Boyfriend-girlfriend	2,678	19%
b. Drug use	2,107	15%
c. Family problems	2,080	15%
d. School-related issues	1,983	14%
e. Legal issues	625	4%
f. Pregnancy	534	4%
g. Runaway	369	3%
h. Self-image, concept	296	2%
i. Medical	242	2%
j. Alcohol use	130	1%
k. Miscellany	174	1%
TOTAL	13,959	100%

Thus, the users of the centers are coming for two different kinds of reasons. One large effort is their seeking of specific information about a host of problem-related issues. They want to find out something, and this may or may not be pertinent to a specific problem they are experiencing. The center is serving a necessary function as an information office; it is providing or guiding the student to appropriate information.

A second function is dealing with specific problem experiences of the youngsters. Here, four issues are central--problems with boyfriends and girlfriends, drug problems,

family problems and school-related problems. Although the state program centers on substance abuse, it also recognizes that problems in that specific area may be closely related to a larger set of problems befalling youngsters.

Student Attitudes Toward SSCs. It is in the TRIAD (Flint) regional program that the greatest emphasis and development on SSCs has occurred in the last four years. This program served as a basic model for other regions in their subsequent development of such centers. In the spring of 1975, students at two high schools within the Flint area were surveyed as to their attitudes toward the SSCs in their school. The instruments had been drafted by this evaluation team, and administered by TRIAD staff members.

One instrument was designed for center users; the other was designed for the entire student body for a given school, to tap their perceptions toward the centers existing in their schools, whether they had ever chosen to use the center or not.

Both instruments were administered on a pilot study basis, resulting in data from 38 students who had used the center and 49 students in the general student body. Thus, these data were collected and are reported here, not for definitive purposes, but because they do provide some additional direct estimates of center experiences, center acceptance, and center utility.

Let us first look to the responses of those students who were interviewed because they had availed themselves of the center facility.

Overall, the center users were most pleased with the help they had sought and received from the center staff. Three questions assessed degree of perceived helpfulness.

To the question, "On the whole, how helpful has the center staff been to you?", the responses were:

Very helpful	61%
Quite helpful	30%
Not very helpful	3%
Not at all helpful	6%

A segment sought factual information. They were asked, "Did you get what you wanted?" 97% said yes.

A further question probed, "If you had reason to, how would you feel about visiting the center again?"

I would definitely come back	74%
I would probably come back	26%
I doubt that I would come back	0%
I definitely would not come back	0%

Emphasized equally in this instrument was the youngsters' perception of what significant others--parents, friends, teachers--thought about the centers, their purpose, their existence. Again, these students perceived distinctly favorable impressions in others.

Three-fourths of those who believed they knew what these others thought reported that their parents and their teachers thought it was either "a very good thing to have in the school" or "okay." With a single exception, this was their unanimous feeling as to what their friends believed about the centers. Elsewhere in the survey, these same youngsters reported that two of these significant groups were their primary source of

initial information about the student service centers. That is, it was friends, teachers, and center staffers who were most likely to have informed them directly about the center and its services.

We remind the reader that this is a very small, and perhaps unreliable set of data. They do suggest great satisfaction with SSCs by center users, and considerable credibility for the centers, as perceived by these same users, for themselves, and for their friends and families.

Furthermore, the results from the parallel study--that of the student body at large--are supportive of such tentative conclusions. In our presentation here, we are deleting the responses of that sub-group who had themselves used the center, inasmuch as their responses might bias the findings. They were as overwhelmingly favorable as those in the separate study of center users.

In the school-wide study, the youngsters were asked how helpful they thought the center was for students who go there. Among those who expressed an opinion, their responses were:

Very helpful	44%
Quite helpful	39%
Not very helpful	17%
Not helpful at all	0%

They were then asked how helpful they thought other students believed the center to be, with these responses:

Very helpful	18%
Quite helpful	73%
Not very helpful	9%
Not helpful at all	0%

Finally, they were asked how helpful teachers seem to think the center is. And here, there is a significant shift from what the center-using students perceived.

Very helpful	15%
Quite helpful	30%
Not very helpful	45%
Not helpful at all	10%

We will draw some inferences from this last piece of information below. First, we were interested in determining what these non-using students thought of the overall job being done by the student staff at the center--as an indication of their acceptance of the basic concept of peer staffing:

Very good	3%
Good	58%
So-so	33%
Bad	3%
Very bad	3%

A further assessment of their acceptance of student staff members in the SSCs was the direct question, "Do you think it is a good idea to have students work in the center?" They responded:

Very good idea	35%
Good idea	56%
Not a very good idea	6%
Not at all a good idea	3%

Thus, the students who have not used the center do have positive attitudes toward the center, its helpfulness for students who go there, and for the idea of peer assistance.

More than 90% of them believed the center should "definitely" or "probably" continue to operate. But these positive attitudes have substantial room for gain. There is not overwhelming acceptance by non-users. And there is personal rejection of self-use of the centers, as demonstrated below.

This of course may be inherent in their designation as non-users. They do believe it is all right for somebody else. But, when asked, "If you had a problem with your school work, how likely would you be to go to the center for help?", they said:

Very likely	3%
Quite likely	14%
Not very likely	39%
Not likely at all	44%

And their responses to "If you had a personal problem of some kind, how likely would you be to go to the center for help?", were:

Very likely	6%
Quite likely	17%
Not very likely	50%
Not likely at all	27%

Thus, the non-users generally believe their teachers do not believe the centers are helpful, and they themselves are disinclined for direct personal use. The reasons for such rejection are as yet inadequately identified and should be the central focus of subsequent evaluation research on the efficacy of student service centers. Some clues exist in open-ended responses to questions in this study. Some non-users perceived that the centers are for drug addicts, discipline problems,

and those who may be generally "screwed up." Others believe that no positive help can be obtained.

In essence, the centers are busy places, drawing substantial portions of student bodies for some key problem assistance. The users are more than satisfied with the attention and information received. Non-users are less enraptured, but perhaps poorly informed.

Activity: SCHOOL-RELATED SKILL AND RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

The major share of the SAPE effort to reduce and prevent substance abuse is focused on Michigan educational institutions. Through its school-related skill and resource development (SRSRD) programs, the focus comes down to the school classroom. There, students learn not only about history and math. More subtly, they also learn about a host of personal and interpersonal processes. This school-based program is designed to help make these learning experiences constructive, and to inform school personnel of the positive consequences of integrating such experiences into existing curricula. It is believed that they have both direct and indirect consequences with regard to attitudes toward and abuse of drugs and other substances.

The primary direct recipients of this program's services are classroom teachers. In terms of contact hours and probable influence, teachers are considered important front-line professionals in the fight against substance abuse. A realization of the importance of teachers in education and prevention efforts, in fact, influenced many of the SAPE professional staff to relinquish public school teaching roles for their present positions. Of the 20 professionals, 12 were classroom teachers, and five others were in professional capacities in educational institutions. Their own school experience has facilitated

the development of effective and extensive working relationships with K-12 school district teachers.

It is difficult to categorize the components of the school-related skill and resource program as the units are interdependently integrated. Still, three major concept and skill areas emerge:

1. The first centers on teacher-student and student-student interaction, and includes self-concept development, role-playing, values clarification, group discussion, communication, empathy, and listening skills.

2. A second area presents alternative approaches to curriculum development. Program segments here include educational design, affective education, teacher-skills development, and strategies teachers can use to develop, promote, and implement curriculum revisions.

3. Classroom climate is the focus of the third content area, providing ideas and skills germane to classroom conflict resolutions, creative problem-solving, and student responsibility for classroom events.

Many administrators, counselors, and students also participate in SRSRD programs. Sometimes they enroll concurrently with teachers for clinics, seminars, and workshops. Other times, the regional staffs design intensive, specialized programs for these segments of the school community. A basic premise of the school-based programs is that shared understanding and values, followed by mutual cooperation among school people

in different roles, and among students, is vital to substance abuse education and prevention.

The conduct of this program exemplifies two fundamental principles in the SAPE regions' approach to their educational mission. The first is that no group of "outsiders," no matter how skilled or well-organized, can hope to have the effect on young people of those who are close to them, who deal with them every day. Where life patterns are concerned, limited contact tends to lead to limited influence. For this reason, SAPE programs are oriented to teachers, administrators, counselors, and parents as much as to direct student participation.

Second, even if the SAPE professionals could generate extensive contact hours with students, it is more efficient to channel their energies through schools and families, as established social institutions. Every teacher who develops substance abuse education and prevention skills has more contact with more students than the region staffs could hope to have themselves. Every school principal or superintendent who becomes involved in the effort impacts on teachers as well as students. And every parent has more opportunity for direct practice and use of newly acquired skills and information.

While only partial data exist to assess the validity of these two principles, the assembled data show some empirical support, in light of program popularity and participant satisfaction.

Evaluation Findings

The central importance of the SRSRD programs is attested strongly by the amount of time each devotes to them. For four regions, this activity encompassed from 29%-44% of their total effort. In these four areas, the activity was their maximal programming time output, and in Region 12, school-related programs encompassed one-fifth of the staff's efforts.

All five regions included values clarification and communication skills as program components, while differing considerably in the presentation of other topics and skills. Drug knowledge, empathy and listening, and problem-solving were listed by two or three regions each.

Program length was also quite varied. Shorter in-service clinics lasted from 4 to 15 hours over a two-day period. The number of in-service presentations ranged from 3 in TRIAD to 23 in Region 12. The longer seminars, classes, and workshops ran from 24 to more than 100 hours, in multiple sessions spanning 5 days to 12 weeks. TRIAD was involved in three of the longer programs, while GATEWAY was responsible for the largest set of long programs, 27. DARTE directed 24 lengthy programs, Region 21 presented 17, and Region 12 organized 12.

The number of school professionals and students who participated in these programs is impressive. More than 3,300 people learned concepts and skills across the five regions. This figure for degree of participation is second only to the total attending core concept presentations among the seven

SAPE program areas. The recruiting base for both programs is the same. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that a large number of core concept recipients were indeed sold on SRSRD activities through that mutual effort.

Based on data from four of the regions, teachers comprised 80% of the total participants. Most of these were high school teachers. Eight percent of the participants were students, 7% were administrators, and the remainder were counselors, parents, social workers, psychologists, and others.

Participant Reaction. During the 1974-75 program year, the regions made extensive efforts to formally and systematically gather feedback from SRSRD participants. Because of differences in data collection and reporting procedures among the five regions, the data cannot be aggregated to present a summary picture of participant response. Nevertheless, it can be demonstrated that participants responded quite favorably overall. The sample of reactions presented in this section is representative of cross-region reports.

Immediate Post-Program Reactions

Two regions asked participant groups for their overall assessments of the training they received. One reported that in eight different events (98 people altogether), an average of 69% of the participants made an overall evaluation as excellent or good. The other reported these reactions from 165 people in nine different events:

Very useful	45%
Useful	47%
Not useful	4%
Not worth coming	4%

The two regions also wanted to know what level of credibility their participants perceived in the staff persons and/or consultants responsible for the trainings. One hundred sixty-five people have this aggregate rating:

Excellent	45%
Satisfactory	49%
Poor	6%

One hundred eighty-seven people, from 11 different training groups, were asked to indicate their level of agreement with the statement:

"The trainer was knowledgeable about the subject."

On a 5-point response scale, their average rating looked like this:

Strongly Disagree ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ↓ Strongly Agree

These participants were quite pleased with the training they received, and with the individuals responsible for the training. And yet, as any teacher knows, people may very well enjoy a classroom or training experience, but believe they got little of practical value. To examine this issue, the same two regions each asked a pair of questions tapping perceptions of on-the-job applicability of SRSRD programs.

Asked whether they agreed or disagreed with the statement:

"This workshop will help me to be a more effective teacher."

One hundred eighty-seven participants combined to give this response:

Strongly Disagree ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ↓ Strongly Agree

Seventy-three other participants were asked how much they felt they could apply what they had learned in summer training sessions when they returned to work in September. They were moderately convinced that they could, giving this aggregate reply:

Not at all ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ↓ : ___ : ___ A great deal

Two similar queries were put to an additional 165 people:

"To what extent do you have confidence that members of your group have the capabilities to incorporate these techniques into a substance abuse program in your school district or community?"

Extremely confident	43%
Confident	50%
Doubtful	3%
No way	4%

"To what degree do you feel your workshop efforts may be beneficial to pupils in your classes?"

A great deal	44%
Some	48%
A little	4%
Not at all	4%

The above data reflect the opinions of 523 different people, attending 30 different events. That is, the combined reactions of 45% of the nearly 1,200 SRSRD participants from just two regional programs show strong confidence in the practical effectiveness of their training toward the combatting

of substance abuse. This is probably sufficient representation to estimate that the ratings of the remaining 55% would have been very similar.

Follow-up Program Reactions

It is now appropriate to report on an additional set of regional evaluation data for SRSRD programs. The question must be raised whether participant excitement over their training would not evaporate after they actually tried to apply the training in a real, on-the-job classroom situation.

To tap this issue, some of the regions collected follow-up data after their participants returned to their home sites. They conducted surveys from one to three months after the conclusion of an event. One region asked the following questions of 21 past participants, with these responses:

"What is your evaluation of the training you received?"

Excellent	30%
Above average	65%
Below average	5%
Poor	0%

"Have you made use of or shared the information presented at the clinic in class, with administrators, or with students?"

82% said they had used or shared the information.

"With what degree of success (have you shared or used it)?"

Very successful	26%
Moderately successful	63%
None at all	11%

"Do you think that your thinking has been changed in any way as a result of attending this clinic?"

Yes	75%
No	25%

"Do you feel any of your actions have changed because of participating in this program?"

Yes	55%
No	45%

Behaviors were more difficult to change than attitudes. Nevertheless, these same people, when asked:

"How do you feel about the prospects of implementation or establishment of (these) ideas into your school district's substance abuse education and prevention program," said:

Extremely confident	0%
Confident	70%
Doubtful	30%
Poor	0%

These responses were given from actual experience in trying to use the concepts and skills presented in the training sessions. Participants have not only immediate, but also longer lasting esteem for the program they attended.

Credit Classes

Four of the five regions offered college classes for university credit to teachers, as part of their SRSRD program. GATEWAY reports the following reactions from four class groups totalling 67 people.

When asked for their overall assessment on the last day of class, their responses, on the average, looked like this:

interesting	↓	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___ boring
impractical	___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ↓ practical
useful	↓	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___ useless
dull	___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ↓	: ___ exciting
worth my time	↓	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___ not worth my time
uninformative	___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ___	: ↓ informative

Five further assessments were made. The next three questions asked respondents to respond from 0-100.

"How likely is it that you would participate in another program put on by us?"

91 was the average likelihood response

"How likely would you be to recommend to other people that they take this program if it were repeated in your area?"

95 was the average response

"How much do you think such programs are needed in this area?"

96 was the average response

On these three important dimensions--interest in further programs, recommendation of programs, and perception of need for programs--the citizens were uniformly impressed with the training they had received. Two additional questions probed participants' perceptions of the utility of the classes:

"How useful do you think this program will be in your personal life?"

Very useful	42%
Quite useful	52%
Not very useful	6%
Not useful at all	0%

"How useful do you think this program will be in your professional life?"

Very useful	49%
Quite useful	49%
Not very useful	2%
Not useful at all	0%

In Region 21, two different affective education courses were offered for credit a total of 10 times in 1974-75. Those attending the courses, most of them teachers, were asked to evaluate the courses and their applicability to their professional objectives. The evaluations were overall quite positive. Here are a few of the questions asked, and the reaction of the average participant:

"Does the instructor have a thorough knowledge and understanding of his teaching field?"



"If you had to rate and compare (this class) to other classes you had taken, how would you describe it?"



"If you had the opportunity to take a similar course again, would you take it?"



The potential impact of the teacher participants in these courses may be roughly estimated by noting that, altogether, they reported working with more than 10,000 different students each school week.

Region 12 conducted a telephone survey of 32 of the 84 people who had enrolled for credit in a teacher training course. When asked, "Have you done anything differently in your classroom as a result of this course?", 94% said that they had. This very high behavior-change rate is even more credible considering that the interviewers only counted as "Yes" answers those who could name some specific change. Eighty-one percent of this sample also reported an interest in further developing their new skills through follow-up and additional programs in their area.

Perhaps this overall, highly favorable reaction to SAPE college course teaching would not hold for all classes in all regions. However, since the participating teachers were already getting graduate credits from the courses, there should have been little perceived need to justify their enrollment by exaggerating their feelings about the course value. This reasoning supports the contention that the highly favorable self-report data are attributable to a high quality in the training itself.

DARTE Team Leadership Training

The final set of SRSRD data is from the DARTE region. DARTE operates a unique Team Leadership Training program which merits separate presentation. A Leadership Team is composed of 6-12 teachers, administrators, counselors, students, and community members from a school district or school building. Team members are selected according to their interest in and commitment to substance abuse education and prevention. Each team receives about 36 hours of DARTE training over a three-week period. After the training period, the teams return to their schools and attempt to make others aware of substance abuse issues and facts, create interest among key people in establishing substance abuse programs in their schools, often training these people when possible, and precipitate the establishment of such programs. The DARTE assumption is that an organized team of people, continually supporting one another, can have more impact than more loosely connected individual change agents.

These data from 53 participants in two team Leadership Training cycles represent their reactions to the workshops themselves. Data are given separately for Group A (from one cycle of 28 people), for Group B (from a second cycle of 25 people), and for both combined.

"When you think back over this workshop, how useful has it been to you, as an individual?"

	Group A	Group B	Combined
Very useful	49%	59%	53%
Useful	51%	41%	47%
Not useful	0%	0%	0%
Not worth coming	0%	0%	0%

"To what extent do you have confidence that your team has the capabilities to play a leadership role in developing a substance abuse education program in your school district?"

	A	B	Both
Extremely confident	49%	59%	53%
Confident	51%	41%	47%
Doubtful	0%	0%	0%
No way	0%	0%	0%

Participant evaluation of the workshops and confidence in their eventual success are high.

DARTE then collected follow-up data 3-4 months after the end of the last training session for each group. Fifty-four percent from Group A responded to the request for follow-up information, while 84% responded from Group B. Overall reactions continue to be very positive.

The first question asked the participants to post-hoc evaluate the workshop training in light of their subsequent experiences:

	A	B	Both
Excellent	7%	40%	23%
Above average	93%	58%	76%
Below averate	0%	0%	0%
Poor	0%	2%	1%

Two additional questions concerned perceived changes in thinking and actions as a result of the trainings.

Changed thinking:

	A	B	Both
Yes	80%	62%	69%
No	20%	38%	31%

Changed actions:

Yes	82%	66%	72%
No	18%	34%	28%

About 70% of the participants, then, reported some kind of change during the post-training interval. And here, the behavior change reported is as extensive as the change in attitudes.

A further question asked whether the team members had made any use of their training. Ninety-three percent from Group A, and 76% from Group B said, "Yes." DARTE then asked for how successful had been their attempted use of their training, and received these answers:

	A	B	Both
Very successful	21%	10%	15%
Moderately successful	71%	74%	73%
Not successful at all	8%	16%	12%

The team members were asked if they believed they had the capabilities for leadership roles in substance abuse prevention. Since almost the same question was asked at the close of their training (p. 52), it is useful to compare perceptions of their confidence at two points in time.

	Both	
	Immediate Post-training	Follow-up Period
Extremely confident	53%	6%
Confident	47%	48%
Doubtful	0%	40%
Poor	0%	6%

The reduction in overall confidence--by nearly 50% from end of training to follow-up--is striking. Perhaps the reduction can be explained by overly high confidence levels at the outset, coupled with some frustration in trying to "change the system" in a few short months.

To summarize the DARTE leadership team findings, data from two training cycles indicate that teams tend to be very favorable about the training received, embarking on their mission with high hopes. Their confidence in their abilities to effect change diminish somewhat over time, while they remain generally positive in their evaluation and outlook. They feel that they themselves have changed positively as a result of their training experience and that they have had some success in implementing their programs.

Summary of Participant Reactions. We have illustrated and interpreted four kinds of data from those collected by the regions concerning participant reactions to SRSRD programs.

First, we reviewed some general immediate reactions of participants to the programs they attended. In terms of perceived usefulness, staff credibility, and expectations that

their training would help them become more effective in their work, the participants were very favorable in their responses.

Second, we examined some follow-up responses gathered from participants who had had several months to test their new skills in realistic situations. Their continued favorable evaluations of their training, self-reports of success in applying their skills, and continuing high confidence levels attest to the "staying power" of these SAPE programs.

Third, we looked at data gathered both immediately following and some time after the conclusion of region-taught college classes for teachers. Participant response was overwhelmingly favorable on several important dimensions, including interest in further training, recommendation of training to others, and expected and experienced utility of the course materials and training experiences.

Finally, we summarized post-training and follow-up data from two team training cycles. Both teams were strongly impressed with their DARTE experience. While their self-confidence in achieving success in implementing substance abuse programs diminished over time, there were still firm indications that they would continue to work toward those goals.

Activity: TRAINING OF TRAINERS

One of the core philosophical elements of the state substance abuse prevention and education program is the "ripple" effect. Indeed, it characterizes most educational programs. The idea is that training provided by staff members to program participants will be further diffused to those with whom the participants come in contact. Here, however, a more formalized implementation of this idea is involved. People will be specifically and systematically trained to carry out the role of diffuser.

The regional programs carry from three to five staff persons per region. Their service goals and target populations are too extensive and too widespread to ever be fully serviced by this cadre of professionals, given even current demands.

Thus, within each program activity, it has seemed useful to create a cluster of volunteer and paid para-professionals who have demonstrated competence after training to expand the provision of regional services. This is the training of trainers program. Such trainees may be students, teachers, parents, or anyone else with a committed interest in substance abuse prevention and education efforts in Michigan.

At present, the trainers are largely devoted to family education and school-related skills and resource development

services. At some early point in their training, they serve to assist regional staff members in presenting programs, or parts of programs. Eventually, trainers tend to create their own programs, often presenting them to groups not presently served by the regional programs themselves. Often, these are church, social, and other community groups.

The end product of the training of trainers program, then, is a greater number of trained people working toward substance abuse education and prevention, and a much wider range of outreach by the regional programs.

Evaluation Findings

This program component is emphasized quite variably in the five regions. In DARTE and Region 12, it is a negligible activity, consuming but 4%-5% of staff time. In GATEWAY and Region 21, it is still minor, with a 10%-12% emphasis. Only in TRIAD has the training of trainers concept become a major program component. There, the staff devoted 21% of its time to reassessing and redeveloping the program, as well as to actual trainer training.

Training. The training cycle varies far less from region to region. In all regional developments of this activity, the training cycle ranges from 40-65 hours, across 4-8 days.

The topics covered during this training include both content areas and performance skills. It is as necessary to

teach adequate training methods as it is to develop competency in the content to be covered. These are some performance areas developed:

Group process skills

Presentation skills

Facilitating skills

Session planning

Simulation and games

Educational design

Group theory

Leadership styles

Group roles

Group norms

Group leadership practice

The development of maximum content skills is central to this training effort. During the past year, the regions provided training for would-be trainers in:

Empathic problem-solving

Communication skills

Confrontation skills

Recall skills

Feedback skills

Self-defeating behaviors

Family communication skills

Affective education skills

School policies and procedures

Communication and trust building

School organization

Functional and dysfunctional behaviors

Those undergoing such program work are evaluated subsequently by the professional staff as to their ability to perform as trainers. The regional staffs apply a combination of criteria in determining and testifying to the competence of their trainers. During the training sessions, participants are carefully observed for progress and development as potential trainers. At the conclusion of training cycles, the staff discuss and assess each participant's learning, motivation, ability, and commitment among themselves and with each participant. Those who are considered acceptable begin an apprentice period. They work with more advanced trainers in regional programs, with close supervision. As these trainees progress, their responsibilities increase. Eventually, they begin to train on their own, including the planning and management of program activity.

Participants. In all, during 1974-75, 245 people underwent training to become trainers. About one-third of these were high school students, whereas the remainder consisted of groupings of teachers, parents, school counselors, school administrators, and community group members. Basically, then, the twenty paid staff members across the five regional programs created 10 additional trainers for each one of themselves.

The largest group of these trained people were developed to work with the schools in some fashion. The students in particular were being trained to train other students for staff positions in student service centers. Two dozen trainers evolved for family education programs. Others were developed for community crisis center activities, additional trainer training, and a special program in the Genessee-based district in "helping relationships."

Utilization. Here, the critical available evaluative data can focus on whether these new trainers did anything with their newly obtained skills. In our opinion, the concept of giving others the ability to train is strongly reinforced by the results from the current evaluation year.

This second generation of trainers was involved as staff in 215 different training events during the year. Given that not all the trainer personnel did participate, nevertheless, this first year output suggests that each trainee can be expected to participate in at least one event after training, during the first year afterward. Of course, these people can continue in subsequent years to create additional experiences. In fact, since many of these people did not complete their own training until very close to the end of the current evaluation year, it is notable that there was this much participation, as recorded by the regions.

Approximately 40% of the events in which they participated were region-sponsored. Stated otherwise, fully 60% of

all the events they were in would probably not have existed if they had not been available to organize their own efforts, or to help other agencies.

In what programs were they most active? About one-third of the events they participated in were core concept events, often introductory events for subsequent program development. The remainder ran the gamut of available program activities.

How well attended were the events these second generation trainers worked in? Region data aggregates 5,754 participants in these programs where new trainers were involved. There were 2,480 participants in core concept events and 2,200 in school-related skills development. About 3,400 of them were participants in programs which were not organized and sponsored by the regions. The outreach impact on these citizens is attributable to the diffusion effect of this training concept.

No data exist as to the comparative quality of programs run by professional staff vs. this cadre of citizens. No data exist as to the comparative impact on participants of programs run by these two training bodies. The sheer weight of numbers of participants in the second level training would suggest that there is some satisfaction, but this remains speculative. Large numbers of people were obtaining information and skills that they voluntarily sought. Whether they used these skills, or whether substance abuse was either deterred or prevented is not known. However, it is clear that the service provided to citizens of Michigan in this fashion was extensive.

Let us recap graphically what appears to be the output of this training component, one which does not appear to be a substantial portion of any more than one region's overall activity schedule.

THE DIFFUSION OF TRAINING



In a single year, each staff member generates 10 trainers. Each trainer generates about 23 additional program participants.

Activity: CONSULTATION RESOURCES

Regional staff members are often called upon by citizens and citizen groups to furnish information and guidance about substance abuse education and prevention. Those seeking this service component range in their requests from individuals wanting factual information about particular substances, to district educators wanting advice on developing and/or implementing programs in their schools for young people, or for their faculty. Since these regional programs are largely school-based, however, the bulk of this activity is with teachers, administrators, and school counselors.

Consultation services involve considerable staff time and energy. School personnel and community groups frequently request guidance in assessing program needs, and for developing and implementing programs when needs have been clarified. Those staff members most qualified to deal with the groups' needs may then devote from a few hours to several weeks providing information and guidance. Often a community group will determine that its needs can be met by participating in a regionally sponsored program. Sometimes a new program is created for a particular group's needs. These have included a seminar for school administrators on the implications of school policy on student substance abuse, and a training program for school counselors

on alternative approaches to abuse prevention. A community group may also decide to institute its own program, while continuing to rely on regional services for guidance and staffing.

Other consultation services are more perfunctory, involving responding to information requests. Common requests are for facts about various substances, reasons for abuse, and strategies of prevention and education. Citizens frequently ask for printed materials or films for their groups or classrooms and for the names of qualified speakers on substance abuse topics. The staffs often are able to supply or loan these media resources from their own holdings. If not, they provide information as to where they can be found. Each region has access to a cadre of area professionals who are available to speak on such topics as substance pharmacology, psychology, law, and classroom and community approaches to education and prevention.

Although these various consultation services are widely used, particularly by educational institutions in the five regions, they do not comprise a formal program component in most regions. Consultations are made on a "by request" basis. They are conducted around the formal, scheduled program activities. However, these services do constitute a major program element in terms of the staff time devoted to consultations, and in terms of the volume of community demand for them.

Evaluation Findings

Consulting with individuals and with groups in the intermediate school districts comprises an average of 15% to 20%

of all staff time. Thus, this activity is a major share of program effort, although it is an informal program component. This average does not vary greatly from one regional program to another.

The number of persons served by consultations is impressive, across these regional programs. The following table provides the best estimate available of the frequency and origin of individuals and groups with whom consultations were made during the 1974-75 program year:

Citizens:	parents, social workers community and professional groups	565
School Administrators:	board members, central office staff, principals	696
Teachers:	elementary through college.	946
Students:	elementary through college.	124
School Counselors:	elementary through college	124
DARTE:	This regional program also provided consultations with a group of school people, not subdivided into the above categories.	245
TRIAD:	This regional program also provided consultations with a group of students and counselors, not subdivided	274
GATEWAY:	This regional program also loaned films and materials, and provided services to a number of citizens, not categorized	186
	TOTAL CLIENTS	3160

This strikes us as quite a large number of different people who, one way or another, sought out the regional staff people for information and guidance regarding substance abuse prevention and education. Many of these were one-to-one contacts. A staff member was answering a request for assistance above the normal staff assignments and responsibilities.

Furthermore, the consultations often led to formal program development and enrollments. The regional offices attested to 531 formal enrollments in regionally developed and/or sponsored programs that evolved from these consultations. Thus, in one sense, the "sales rate" of regional programs was 17% from individual and group consultations. Of every 10 consultations, there were approximately two enrollments generated in formal substance abuse education programs.

This is actually an under-estimate of enrollments. Only two of the five regions recorded any form of data which they were willing to defend in terms of enrollments resulting from consultations, whereas the consultation data themselves were provided by four of five regions. Had all regions reported this information, the projected rate of enrollments following consultations might well be in the 30%-40% range.

In essence, then, consultations are a large-scale activity, for which no systematic staff assignments are made, at least at the origin of the consultation. And this activity has a relatively large payoff in its stimulation of additional staff work and responsibility.

There was no formal effort by regional staffs to directly assess client reactions to consultation services, perhaps because of the informal nature of these activities. However, the large number of users of consultation services, and the relatively high rate of other-program enrollment by such users, do provide indirect measures of satisfaction.

In addition, three regions report data which differentiate one-time, single-contact consultations from those which continued over two or more consultation sessions. Those three regions reported 720 single-contact consultations, and 517 of a continuing nature. By a conservative estimate, at least two-thirds of the contacts were requests for services after an initial experience. It seems reasonable to infer that continuing contact clients believed they were deriving benefit from the consultations.

Beyond these elements, no further evaluative data are available. No systematic evidence was collected regarding the responses to the consultations by the requestor, e.g., satisfaction, information gain, plans for renewed contact, implementation of ideas provided. No evidence exists as to whether these consultations lead directly to students. The tabled information indicates that relatively few students are direct consultees. What they may receive indirectly cannot be determined from the extant data. These remain for subsequent evaluation efforts.

ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM COSTS

In this section, we propose to draw together information from all preceding sections in order to create a partial cost analysis of this state program. To our knowledge, this has not been done before, and should be at least one additional indicator of program effectiveness. The bulk of this analysis used four criteria in making its assessment:

1. Distribution of staff time to the seven program activities;
2. Distribution of funds to the regions;
3. Quantity of citizen participation in various program activities; and
4. Participant costs in different program activities across regions.

The first three of these criteria were provided by the regions, from which we derived the fourth.

We would have wished for additional criterion information, e.g., the number of young people deterred from substance abuse, direct assessment of degree of skills acquisition, effectiveness of student service centers, etc. Such information is not sufficiently available at this point to include as indicators. However, plans created for evaluation for the 1975-76 year do include a more sophisticated and thorough approach to evaluation than has been implemented in the past.

Table 1 provides some rather basic information--staff sizes and budgetary allotments. It is rather striking that from but 20 full-time equivalents, distributed across five different but related programmatic efforts, have come all of the work activities described in the preceding sections of this report. This is a relatively small program, whose total budget from state monies is slightly under a half million dollars. The supplemental funds were identified by the Michigan Department of Education and constitute 13% of the total funding.

Table 2 summarizes what each region did, in terms of its staff energy allocation to program activities. Each region provided the evaluation team with information as to how its time was distributed to different program components, i.e., hours per week per staff to these activities. We synthesized the information for all staffs and arrived at the distribution of effort identified in Table 2.

These appear to be proper inferences from the table:

1. The major program component is school-related skills and resource development; it is the primary activity in four of five regions;
2. Two other program components--consultation resources and core concept presentations--have a strong share of effort in four of five regions;
3. One other program--student service centers--appears to be generic, but of less magnitude.

Table 1

Regional Staff Size and Budgets

Region	Staff		Budget			% Total Funds
	Full-Time	Half or Part-Time	State Basic Grant Funds	Other Cash Funds[1]	Total	
DARTE	3	0	$150,794	-0-	$150,794	27%
12	3	2	74,483	$ 6,927	81,410	15
TRIAD	5	0	83,179	26,135	109,314	20
21	3	2	79,470	22,101	101,571	18
GATEWAY	4	0	91,120	15,371	106,491	20
Totals	18	4	$479,046	$70,534	$549,580	100%

[1]Each region is required to obtain 25% in local matching funds, and all did so. The figure in this column reflects that portion of local matching funds which was a cash allotment, plus other cash funds obtained by payments for teaching classes, etc. It does not include in-kind services provided, such as administrator or teacher released time. It also does not include any special training grants which may have been made by the Department of Education for unique programming efforts.

Table 2

Activity Emphasis by Region

Activities	Regions				
	DARTE:	12:	TRIAD:	21:	GATEWAY:
Consultation Resources	21%	18%	11%	16%	17%
Core Concepts	15	3	24	20	11
Family Education	3	37	2	1	0
Student Service Centers	3	17	11	13	13
School-Related Skills	40	19	29	41	44
Training of Trainers	5	4	21	9	11
Organizational Development	13	2	2	0	4
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

4. In only one region are the program activities of family education, training of trainers, and organizational development a significant time share component.

One notes significant differences among regions in terms of program development and emphasis. There is at least as much variance as there is commonality. It would be difficult to fault such an approach, given several reasons for its possible value. For one, the regions differ in terms of population composition and characteristics, and, perhaps, needs. For another, the staffs differ in terms of their background training and conception of the program goals. Foremost, since these regional programs were to serve as models for subsequent reproduction elsewhere, it has been useful to experiment with alternative emphases and activities, to the extent that comparative effectiveness measures can be made available.

Now, let us provide some more specific program cost information. In Table 3, we have estimated program costs per participant across the five regional efforts.

There are several limitations in this preliminary attempt to assess costs, which warrant special note as one analyzes the data. First, we have used staff time as the basis for estimating costs, because those were the best data available to us. In addition to staff time, such factors as material resources and transportation do affect cost and should be included in future estimates. Further, the cost estimates do not give

Table 3

Program Cost Estimates

	% of 5-Region Effort	Total Funds	Total Participants	Cost/ Participant
Consultation Resources	17%	$ 92,699	3,794	$ 24.43
Core Concepts	15	83,324	5,109	16.31
Family Education	7	37,847	249	152.00
Student Service Centers	10	57,437	809	71.00
School-related Skills	36	195,987	3,326	58.93
Training of Trainers	10	54,607	245	222.89
Organizational Development*	5	27,677	11	$3516.09

*Here, the unit analyzed was number of school climate data collections, not number of individual participants.

credit for volunteer or trained trainers, but are pro-rated only against professional staff time. Further, all costs, including planning costs, are in these estimates. Obviously, if a region spent a considerable amount of time in planning during the current evaluation cycle, the costs are going to be higher. Next year, those costs for that program should be much lower. It is a true estimate for the current evaluation year, however.

Even with these qualifications, the data should be taken as the best approximation available for the programs. The figures should be looked at as relative cost figures; the imprecision in the original data do not make it possible to take the exact figures at face value. But they do yield what we judge to be reasonable estimates of the program costs for this year.*

Interpretation of these data should be made by the administrative group for these programs. However, from our knowledge of the program, the relative sizes of costs make a good deal of intuitive sense. The first two--the cheapest--are largely public information activities, designed to promote more intensive educational programs. There is a strong relationship between per participant costs and number of participants served. The next three, then, are the more

---

*A comparable breakdown of program costs, by region, is presented in Appendix A. That breakdown warrants the same limitations noted here, only moreso. The cross-region estimates are likely to be better approximations than the estimates for any single region.

intensive educational programs, and the costs are increased. Family education costs are largest among those three because the program is smallest across the regions. As the number of participating regions increase, so does the number of participants, and overall average costs decrease. The costs for student service center training encompass only those who were trained as staff helpers. Obviously, the data reported earlier indicate an extensive number of contacts with students in the center, for whom guidance was provided. Contacts are not part of this cost estimate.

In most regions there was extensive staff planning, differentially across program components. Sometimes a staff spent considerable time reviewing and revamping a well-developed program, and sometimes they gave their attention to programs they intended to develop further during that year or the next. One region--TRIAD--for instance, spent nearly one-third of last year reorganizing their training programs. While planning and reviewing efforts are essential to a pilot program, and are likely to yield long-term efficiency and effectiveness dividends, they do inflate the per-program participant cost for the year reported.

Training of trainers has the largest per individual participant cost. Given the notion that such people once trained will spread that training in a geometric diffusion pattern, there should eventually be determined a manner of prorating these costs over the number subsequently trained.

Insofar as training of trainers is concerned, we would remind you that no credit has been given here for second generation participants--those trained by the 245 trainers listed in Table 3. Evidence presented earlier suggested that there were about 20 such participants for each trained trainer. At some point, these people must be integrated into the program cost estimates. For example, each trainer cost $222 to train. But in turn, that trainer trained an average of 23 persons, so the cost of training each of them was about $10. That is a cost reduction of a magnitude too large to ignore, but for which an adequate fiscal accounting procedure is not yet available. Clearly, this should be considered in interpreting the present results.

For organizational development, the consultation and planning costs that went into the program are absorbed in the cost computation. All such costs are absorbed whether they resulted in data collections or not. Therefore, the sizable per field study costs represent all effort that went into school-climate assessments. Basically, this is designed to tell a region and a school district where it stands before substance abuse prevention education programs begin. This is relatively expensive, but baseline information is mandatory if one is going to assess program impact. Whether the baseline information costs can be reduced is another consideration.

It is expensive to design instruments, collect and analyze data, write interpretative reports based on those data,

and do the myriad of other tasks necessary for proper school climate assessment. The average cost of $2500 per data collection is probably a reasonable figure. However, if the regions can agree on a common instrument, or common subsections in an instrument, then much of the effort could be routinized and costs reduced accordingly. Such an instrument has been developed and proposed by this evaluation team and has been filed with the SAPE staff. Estimated costs for a sample of 200 students and 50 faculty should be in the $1500-$2000 range per administration.

The main point of this section has been to illuminate information not otherwise available. We do not advocate program evaluations based solely on their cost. We do believe that this section demonstrates some appropriate considerations in costing programs by both the regional directors and their state supervisors. Given some relatively hard information on what something costs, it should facilitate internal decisions as to subsequent actions regarding the programs.

To close this section, we shall offer a state-wide figure, across these five regions, for training programs:

The total state funds committed during 1974-75 were $479,046.

The total number of program participants in direct training experiences were 13,532.

Therefore, the cost per participant from state monies was $35.40 across all the different kinds of activities described in this report, and an additional expenditure of $5.21 from other cash funds.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PROGRESS IN EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TECHNIQUES

This closing section will draw on our experience from this year in working with regional evaluation data, and suggest evaluation procedures which should yield more comprehensive information. Indeed, in two earlier reports to the Department of Education, we have suggested in considerable detail how these procedures could be implemented.

It is important to recall that this educational effort is still relatively new and still essentially a pilot program. Many recommendations we make stem from the fact that the staffs may not have had sufficient time to implement some things which they fully intend to do.

In light of this pilot program status, our recommendations stem from a number of critical observations. First, there are large differences among regions in the attention which has already been given to evaluation processes. These differences exist in terms of staff attitudes toward the need and utility of evaluation, staff skills in coping with evaluation needs, and prior efforts in trying out and implementing appropriate evaluation procedures.

Second, among regions, there is almost no commonality in evaluation procedures now in use. For example, each region

has its own workshop evaluation forms, if any, its own means of auditing program participants, its own means of computing training costs, if any.

Third, because regions do differ and will continue to do so, in terms of program content, it is not possible to suggest a single process of evaluation. At best, we should and will propose some areas for standardization of instruments, but will not advocate abandoning existing instruments where regions find them useful, or where our own recommendations do not overlap.

Finally, and most critically, the program is only beginning to be able to cope with the fundamental question of measuring program impact on young people. There is too little systematic information available, too little evaluation made of the program's impact on the adults and community groups receiving training programs.

Until evaluation procedures are developed which can tell staff people what kinds of impacts the program is having on those receiving direct training or training from trainers, it is premature to ask what second level impact those people are having on the youth with whom they are in regular contact.

Recommended Development of Evaluation Measures

First, let us outline in some detail the specific areas of evaluation and types of instrumentation it would seem are most desirable for immediate development and implementation.

When this has been done, we shall also propose a management strategy for overseeing the evaluation component of this program.

Common procedures are needed for the following:

I. Auditing procedures for program participants. There should be established a common format for rostering program participants, and certain attributes of those participants, e.g., sex, age, occupation, number of young people with whom they have regular contact. It is critical that regions determine their potential out-reach through an accurate means of counting and describing their program clients. Whether the program is a 50-minute session, or a 20-week course, it should become a routine task to compile this information, and to do so in the same way in different parts of the state.

II. Auditing procedures for consultations. The consultations made almost daily by many regional staff are the ones least likely to show up in most regional summaries of staff activities. Yet this is another important and time-consuming area of effort. Consultation information should be conveniently recorded, stored, and retrieved for annual evaluation purposes. This record would note type of information need, disposition, possible follow-ups, etc.

III. Participants' reactions to individual programs. Whether they be in-service programs, classes or workshops, and whether they exist in one-shot sessions, or stretch over several months, some of the dimensions of participants' reactions to

programs can be obtained in a common fashion, regardless of program content.

We recommend developing a format for tapping participants' responses to individual program presentations, e.g., what they liked and didn't like, what they found most and least useful, how they'll follow up, if at all, whether they'll come back if given the opportunity to do so, etc. This evaluation segment would be content-free, i.e., would not tap what they learned, except in a self-report fashion.

IV. Follow-up procedures with those who complete a regional program. Here there is need to focus on activities that are not merely introductory presentations, but in-depth, in-services, formal classes, or longer training cycles. Follow-up evaluation would again attempt to be free of any particular program, but usable across most programs. Such a follow-up instrument would tap subsequent use of program skills, instances of use, the population serviced with the new skills, self-report evidence of their utility and success, etc.

V. Student service center evaluation. For schools with existing service centers, it is necessary to do three basic kinds of evaluation: (1) school-wide awareness of and knowledge about the services available in the centers, with accompanying assessments of the students' attitudes toward the centers; (2) usage and clientele information of the center activity itself, with problem incidence, service satisfaction,

self-described behavior changes, and certain client attributes, e.g., age, sex, severity of problem, and recidivism, all tallied anonymously; and (3) an attempt to tap the impact of the student service center on general school climate.

VI. School climate assessment. Here there is need to develop and use a common instrument for assessing the attitudes of school people--students, faculty, and administrators. The major purpose of this instrument is to tap systemic impact of a regional program, or a cluster of regional programs on a given school, or school system.

We suggest that the regions consider a "modular" instrument, one in which it is possible to select attitudinal scales from a variety of attitude areas. For example, this instrument might have sections which tap general school attitude, perceived student efficacy, teacher-student relationships, conception of rules and regulations of the school, and substance abuse attitudes. Then, a given region could select all or a subset of these scales for use in a given school or school system. Obviously such an instrument must be used on multiple occasions, with the first occurring before the region has begun an effort in the school. In this manner, changes in school climate can more correctly be inferred.

VII. Trainer development programs. Here, the regions are working with a special group of people, themselves interested in becoming trainers and diffusing the program's content and philosophy. Internal staff evaluation procedures for trainees

vary greatly; some qualify through sheer number of experiences, others through rigorous review processes. Staffs might wish to consider their internal needs for trainee evaluation, peer evaluation, staff evaluation, etc.

In addition, it is essential to be able to document the work that trainees do, when they are able to pursue program development on their own. It should be possible to obtain their subsequent use of the same program recording forms and workshop reaction instruments that are suggested above as necessary for direct region programs. That is, to the extent that this second generation of trainers can assemble evaluation data from their own efforts, their own utility can be more adequately assessed, and the cost of this program more properly pro-rated across both those who train them and those who receive original training.

VIII. Skills test development. For each of the training programs developed at the regional level, there should exist a formal means of testing skills development. For example, there are programs in values clarification, family communication, self-defeating behaviors, etc. In each content area, trainees should be assessed as to entry level skills, and then again at the conclusion of the program. Here, we are suggesting going beyond their affective response to a program, and urging the development of appropriate measures of how well they learn what is offered, and how well they can use it in practical situations. Little of this now exists across the regional programs.

When it is possible to assess the degree of skills development, then it is possible to obtain more useful data from the receivers of those newly skilled citizens. That is, if teachers learn values clarification and report practicing it in their classroom, evaluation data should be obtained from the classroom itself, to determine if there is any direct impact on the ultimate receivers of this training emphasis.

Recommended Management Plan for Evaluation

Because regions have been left on their own for purposes of creating evaluation strategies, the lack of commonality in evaluation efforts is not surprising. For the type of effort we are recommending in subsequent years, a different mode of coordination is required. Essentially, someone at the state level should be more directly responsible for overseeing regional evaluation efforts. This role may be supplemented by an outside evaluation expert, contracted for by the state, but persistent monitoring of regional evaluation efforts must reside at the state level. These then would be major functions for the evaluation administrator and a possible outside consultant:

1. Design and pre-test instrumentation for all the evaluation components outlined earlier in this section;
2. Create procedures wherein regional programs utilize similar participant auditing procedures;

3. Create procedures for the testing of adequate samples of program participants in terms of their responses to program offerings;
4. Design samples for assessing program awareness and perceived program utility;
5. Coordinate the collection of such data in the regions;
6. Process, analyze, interpret, and report the evaluation data collected, and
7. Make recommendations for instrument development and possible program alterations on the basis of collected evaluation information.

We wish to conclude this report with some personal observations, based on this evaluation assignment. We have been most favorably impressed by some qualitative considerations which these data may not completely reflect.

. . . The program staffs consist of very dedicated individuals for the most part, very professional in their approach to their assignments. Their typical work week is not confined to any normal schedule. Frequent weekend programs consume much extra time, for which there appears to be no monetary compensation.

. . . The small staffs give a large number of programs to a large number of citizens who would otherwise most likely not have any such opportunity to interact about substance abuse education and prevention.

. . . Because the staffs are small, it seems that there might be further consideration of reducing the number of different program activities, and focusing in more strongly on what each region believes it can do best, rather than expecting to do everything.

. . . The programs have established strong relationships and liaison with the school districts they serve. We would expect the school administrators to be strongly supportive of continuation of these efforts.

. . . Cross-region coordination of program activity is minimal, and further attention need be paid to this aspect of the state program.

. . . Many evaluation data are skimpy, particularly in terms of documenting the cognitive and affective impact of the program; this should be planned in subsequent years.

. . . Overall, the necessary period of program incubation seems to have been completed. There appears to be sufficient reason and evidence to warrant the extension of this program to additional state regions.

Bradley S. Greenberg
Mark Steinberg

APPENDIX A

PROGRAM COST ESTIMATES BY REGION

Note. The information in this section is provided as a first approximation to actual program costs by regions. Imprecisions may exist because of our method of calculating costs, which we shall describe.

We determined the allocation of staff time to programs, as a percentage of total staff time expenditures. We then multiplied this percentage by the total regional funds in Table 1 and arrived at a per program cost allocation. Dividing this total cost estimate by the number of participants in the program gave us a per participant cost.

Thus, all planning time for a given program is part of that program's cost for the current year. Obviously, if planning is now nearly completed for the coming year, then the next year's cost will be significantly lower. Also, administrative time was not pulled out as a separate figure, but was assumed to be proportioned to program activities at the same level as overall staff time was allocated to that program. Finally, the participant figures used are those who were trained directly in region programs. No credit is given in these estimates for the participants or programs created by the trained trainers, without whom regular staff time would not have been available for creating other programs and participants.

These costs should be looked at relatively, across regions. They do provide an input for internal decision-making. They should be an aid to regions in internal evaluation and subsequent program planning.

Program Participants and Costs by Region

Table 3a: Consultation Resources

	% of Region Effort	Regional Cost	Total Participants	Cost Per Participant
DARTE	21%	$31,667	263	$120.41
12	18	14,653	334	43.87
TRIAD	11	12,025	1,158	10.38
21	16	16,251	634	25.63
GATEWAY	17	18,103	1,405	12.89
5 regions	17%	$92,699	3,794	24.43

Table 3b: Core Concepts

	% of Region Effort	Regional Cost	Total Participants	Cost Per Participant
DARTE	15%	$22,619	925	$24.45
12	3	2,442	1,135	2.15
TRIAD	24	26,235	497	52.79
21	20	20,314	1,773	11.46
GATEWAY	11	11,714	779	15.04
5 regions	15%	$83,324	5,109	$16.31

Table 3c: Family Education

	% of Region Effort	Regional Cost	Total Participants	Cost Per Participant
DARTE	3%	$ 4,524	51	$ 88.71
12	37	30,122	167	180.37
TRIAD	2	2,186	21	104.10
21	1	1,016	10	101.60
GATEWAY	0	0	0	0
5 regions	7%	$37,848	249	$152.00

Table 3d: Student Service Centers

	% of Region Effort	Regional Cost	Total Participants	Cost Per Participant
DARTE	3%	$ 4,524	43	$105.21
12	17	13,840	176	78.64
TRIAD	11	12,025	419	28.70
21	13	13,204	84	157.19
GATEWAY	13	13,844	87	159.13
5 regions	10%	$57,437	809	$ 71.00

Table 3e: School-Related Skills and Resource Development

	% of Region Effort	Regional Cost	Total Participants	Cost Per Participant
DARTE	40%	$ 60,318	456	$132.28
12	19	15,468	1,389	11.14
TRIAD	29	31,701	495	64.04
21	41	41,644	268	155.39
GATEWAY	44	46,856	718	65.26
5 regions	36	$195,987	3,326	$ 58.93

Table 3f: Organizational Development

	% of Region Effort	Regional Cost	No. of Data Collections	Cost Per Data Collection
DARTE	13%	$19,603	6	$3,267
12	2	1,628	1	1,628
TRIAD	2	2,186	2	1,093
21	0	0	0	0
GATEWAY	4	4,260	2	2,130
5 regions	5%	$27,677	11	$2,516

Table 3g: Training of Trainers

	% of Region Effort	Regional Cost	Total Participants	Cost Per Participant
DARTE	5%	$ 7,540	93	$ 81.08
12	4	3,256	9	361.78
TRIAD	21	22,956	32	717.38
21	9	9,141	39	234.39
GATEWAY	11	11,714	72	162.69
5 regions	10%	$54,607	245	$222.89

APPENDIX B

SCHOOL ATTITUDE SURVEY

Listed below are a number of statements made by people describing their feelings about the school they are in. Please read each statement and mark on the separate answer sheet how it best describes your school.

Answer the questions by filling in the boxes on the Answer Sheet, Either A, B, C, or D.

A Strongly Agree B Agree C Disagree D Strongly Disagree

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

DO NOT WRITE ON THIS SHEET

1. Most adults in this school are more interested in controlling kids than they are in helping them to become more successful human beings.
2. Most teachers I know around here seem willing to give up their own free time to help students.
3. Education in this school is usually boring.
4. Very few people in this school really care what happens to the "troublemakers."
5. The student in this school learns because he or she feels it is important for himself or herself and he or she wants to learn.
6. Teachers in this school seem to get upset easily. Any little thing sets them off.
7. There are a wide variety of clubs and activities available in this school.
8. Most adults in this school are pretty honest in their dealings with kids.
9. Teachers in this school know what it is like to be a student.
10. I'm just one of a big crowd here. Nobody really deals with me as an individual.
11. Student publications in this school adequately represent student views.

12. Most adults in this school really seem human.

13. Teachers and administrators in this school are afraid to let students deal openly with controversial issues.

14. Discipline problems in this school are usually handled fairly.

15. The rules and regulations of this school are understood and followed by both staff and students.

16. People in this school are concerned about helping each other.

17. There are far too many rules and regulations in this school.

18. Students in this school have a lot to say about how this school is run.